

F201 968

(2)

PL-TR-93-2167

AD-A279 486




EYESAFE RARE EARTH CRYSTAL LASERS FOR ATMOSPHERE SOUNDINGS

Milton Birnbaum

University of Southern California
Center for Laser Studies
University Park, DRB 17
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1112

1 August 1993

Final Report
5 September 1989-31 May 1993



Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

DTIC QUALITY INSURED



PHILLIPS LABORATORY
Directorate of Geophysics
AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND
HANSCOM AIR FORCE BASE, MA 01731-3010

94-14611




94 5 16 084


"This technical report has been reviewed and is approved for publication"


(Signature)

STEVEN B. ALEJANDRO
CONTRACT MANAGER


(Signature)

DONALD E. BEDO, CHIEF
ELECTRO-OPTICAL MEASUREMENTS BR.


(Signature)

ROGER A. VAN TASSEL, DIRECTOR
OPTICAL ENVIRONMENT DIVISION

This report has been reviewed by the ESC Public Affairs Office (PA) and is releasable to the National Technical Information Service (NTIS).

Qualified requestors may obtain additional copies from the Defense Technical Information Center. All others should apply to the National Technical Information Service.

If your address has changed, or if you wish to be removed from the mailing list, or if the addressee is no longer employed by your organization, please notify PL/TSI, Hanscom AFB, MA 01731-3010. This will assist us in maintaining a current mailing list.

Do not return copies of this report unless contractual obligations or notices on a specific document requires that it be returned.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE 1 August 1993		3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final Technical Report (9/5/89 - 5/31/93)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Eyesafe Rare Earth Crystal Lasers for Atmosphere Soundings				5. FUNDING NUMBERS Contract No.: F19628-89-K-0038 PE 62101F PR 7670 TA 16 WU BA	
6. AUTHOR(S) Milton Birnbaum					
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) University of Southern California Department of Electrical Engineering - Electrophysics Center for Laser Studies University Park - DRB 17 Los Angeles, CA 90089-1112				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Phillips Laboratory 29 Randolph Road Hanscom AFB, MA 01731-3010 Contract Manager: S. Alejandro/GPOA				10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER PL-TR-93-2167	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
12a. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release: Distribution Unlimited				12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) The characteristics of room temperature Er^{3+} :YAG lasers at 1.644μ end pumped by an Er^{3+} :glass laser at 1.535μ are described. Low threshold and efficient operation was obtained for 0.5 and 1% Er^{3+} :YAG. Similar studies were performed utilizing 0.7% Er^{3+} (3% Yb^{3+} , 1% Cr^{3+}) YSGG. Laser action of Er^{3+} :YSGG at 1.643μ was achieved for the first time.					
14. SUBJECT TERMS Solid state lasers; Er^{3+} :YAG:1.64 microns; Er^{3+} :YSGG:1.64 microns				15. NUMBER OF PAGES 90	
				16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR		

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
RESULTS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS	1
CONCLUDING RESTATEMENT OF CONCLUSION	2
1. INTRA-CAVITY 1.549mm PUMPED 1.634mm Er:YAG LASERS AT 300K	3
2. Er:YAG Laser Dynamics: Effects of Upconversion	34
3. 1.643m Er:YSGG laser at 300K	70

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

INTRODUCTION

The focus of this research program was to establish the feasibility of the development of eye-safe lasers operating within an atmospheric window which could then find application in atmospheric sounding and wind-sat applications. Er:crystal lasers (Er:YAG at 1.64 μm and Er:YSGG at 1.64 μm) meet the above criteria and could be utilized for these applications. During the period of this work, interest in the development of eye-safe solid state lasers in particular eye lasers operating near 1.5 μm , has intensified because of the potential applicability of Er:YAG eye-safe lasers.

RESULTS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

All of the major results of our studies are in the process of publication or submission for publication. Therefore our final report consists of copies of our papers in process of publication, accepted for publication and the draft copies of those in process of publication. One Ph.D. Thesis (Electrical Engineering) has been completed under this contract: "Dynamic of Eye-Safe (1.6 μm) Er Lasers" by Kalin Spariosu, May 1993. Copies of the following papers are given in this final report:

1. "Room-Temperature 1.644 Micron Er:YAG Lasers", K.Spariosu and M. Birnbaum, OSA Proceedings on Advanced Solid-State Lasers, 1992, Vol. 13 Lloyd L. Chase and Albert A. Pinto (eds), pp 1276-130.

2. "Intra-Cavity 1.549 μ m Pumped 1.634 μ m Er:YAG Lasers at 300K", K. Spariosu and M. Birbaum accepted for publication in IEEE Jour. of Quantum Electronics.
3. "Er:YAG Laser Dynamics: Effects of upconversion", K. Spariosu, M. Birnbaum and Bruno Viana submitted to JOSA B special issue on Upconversion Lasers.
4. "1.634 μ m Er:YSGG at 300 K", K. Spariosu, M. Birnbaum and M. Kokta submitted to IEEE Jour. Quantum Electronics.

CONCLUDING RESTATEMENT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The results of our investigation indicates tht Er:YAG is the crystal of choice for development of a 1.64 μ m eye-safe laser and that a diode-pumped version of this laser suitable for air-borne and/or satellite application can be developed. The scientific basis for the above assertions will be found in the paper included in this final report.

**INTRA-CAVITY 1.549 μ m PUMPED 1.634 μ m Er:YAG
LASERS AT 300K**

Kalin Spariosu and Milton Birnbaum

Center for Laser Studies

University of Southern California

University Park, DRB 17

Los Angeles, CA 90089-1112

Abstract

A novel method of generating 1.634 μ m laser action from Er:YAG crystals pumped intra-cavity by an Er:glass laser emitting at 1.549 μ m is described. Operation of the Er:glass laser at 1.549 μ m (red shifted from the standard 1.532 μ m, but with comparable output) at 300K was obtained using mirrors with tailored spectral reflectivities. Several Er:YAG crystals ranging in concentration from 0.3% to 2% and in length from 1cm to 8cm were lased in the intra-cavity pumping arrangement. All the Er:YAG crystals lased in the $^4I_{13/2}$: Y1(6544cm⁻¹)- $^4I_{15/2}$: Z6(424cm⁻¹) 1.634 μ m transition at 300K.

Introduction

The first $1.6\mu\text{m}$ $^4\text{I}_{13/2}$ - $^4\text{I}_{15/2}$ laser action was demonstrated in Er:CaWO₄¹ followed by reported laser action in Er:CaF₂², and in Er:LaF₃³ near $1.6\mu\text{m}$. All the above reports utilized flash lamp pumping at 77K. The first $1.645\mu\text{m}$ $^4\text{I}_{13/2}$ - $^4\text{I}_{15/2}$ laser action in Er:YAG was achieved by Johnson et al⁴ at 77K, and later at room temperature, White and Schleusener⁵, again using flash lamp excitation in both cases. More recently, CW oscillation at $1.645\mu\text{m}$ in Er:YAG was achieved using a Kr ion laser at $0.647\mu\text{m}$ in an end pumping arrangement^{6,7}. We reported $1.532\mu\text{m}$ pumped $1.645\mu\text{m}$ Er:YAG lasers at 300K using an Er:glass laser as the pump source in an end pumped configuration⁸. All of the above reported Er:YAG lasers at 300K oscillated in the $^4\text{I}_{13/2}$:Y3(6602cm^{-1})- $^4\text{I}_{15/2}$:Z7(523cm^{-1}) transition at $1.645\mu\text{m}$. Zverev et al⁹ reported on a flash-lamp pumped $1.632\pm 2\mu\text{m}$ $^4\text{I}_{13/2}$:Y3(6549cm^{-1})- $^4\text{I}_{15/2}$:Z7(426cm^{-1}) Er:YAG laser action at 300K.

The first Intra-Cavity (IC) pumped laser was demonstrated by Gapontsev et al¹¹ where they pumped an Yb, Er:glass laser with a flash-lamp pumped $1.054\mu\text{m}$ Nd:glass laser. Their Er:glass laser output manifested itself in 3 different spectral lines: $1.536\mu\text{m}$ near threshold, $1.536\mu\text{m}$ and $1.543\mu\text{m}$ at 1.5 times above threshold, and $1.536\mu\text{m}$, $1.543\mu\text{m}$, $1.538\mu\text{m}$ at 2.5 times above threshold, the $1.543\mu\text{m}$ and the $1.538\mu\text{m}$ being the

weaker lines. This report was followed by a more extensive study of IC Nd:YAG pumping of Yb,Er:glass lasers in several different glass bases (silicates to phosphates) done by Kalinin et al¹².

Further work on the IC Nd:YAG laser pumped Yb,Er:glass laser done by Murzin and Fromzel¹³ yielded a theoretical prediction of the optimum pump absorption coefficient in Yb,Er:glass to be $\alpha_{1.06\mu\text{m}} \approx 0.05\text{cm}^{-1}$. More recently, Aubakirov et al¹⁴ demonstrated a method of raising efficiency of the IC Nd laser pumped Yb,Er:glass laser by the introduction of a spectrally limiting etalon in the cavity. This essentially prevents the shift of the 1.06 μm Nd laser output toward longer wavelengths when an IC Yb,Er:glass load is introduced (also noted by Kalinin et al¹²). A recent report of an IC 1.06 μm Nd:YAG laser pumped Yb,Er:glass laser was done by Anthon and Pier¹⁵, where they utilized diode lasers as the means of exciting the Nd:YAG laser. They noted high efficiencies but limited power scaling potential due to low thermal conductivity of the phosphate glass host. The authors did note, however, that the anticipated Nd:YAG laser wavelength shift (due to the Yb,Er:glass IC load) did not occur and the 1.06 μm pump wavelength remained unchanged.

Other reports on IC lasers included a 3 μm Ho:YAlO₃ laser IC pumped by a flash-lamp pumped 1.079 μm Nd:YAlO₃ laser¹⁶, a 2.1 μm Ho:YAG laser IC pumped by a flash-lamp pumped 2 μm Cr,Tm:YAG laser¹⁷, and a 2.1 μm Ho:YAG laser

IC pumped by a 2 μ m Tm:YAG laser, which in turn was excited by a 785nm Ti:sapphire laser¹⁸. The main justifications cited for using the IC pumping method, were: better mode coupling, lower thresholds, and increased efficiency particularly when the laser medium had a low absorption coefficient at the pump laser wavelength.

In this paper we report on IC pumped Er:YAG lasers where the Er:YAG crystal and the flash lamp pumped Er:glass rod share the same resonator mirrors. The IC pumped Er:YAG lasers operated in the $^4I_{13/2}:Y3(6544\text{cm}^{-1})$ - $^4I_{15/2}:Z7(424\text{cm}^{-1})$, 1.634 μ m transition at 300K. The IC pumping method offers several advantages over the standard outside cavity method of excitation. Namely, due to better mode matching of the Er:YAG laser to the Er:glass pump laser in the same resonator, better efficiency in utilization of the pump light is obtained. Furthermore, unlike the IC Yb,Er:glass lasers which suffer from limited power scaling due to the poor thermal conductivity of glass, the Er:YAG laser could have a much larger dynamic range of operating powers and energies.

This IC pumping method is particularly useful when pumping laser crystals with low absorption cross sections using a low intensity pump source¹⁸. In our particular case, the shifted Er:glass wavelength of 1.549 μ m (from the standard 1.532 μ m) has an absorption coefficient in Er:YAG: $\alpha_{1.549\mu\text{m}}=0.059\text{cm}^{-1}$ ($\alpha_{1.532\mu\text{m}}=1\text{cm}^{-1}$) per one percent Er^{+3} concentration in YAG. Consequently, external laser pumping was not successful using the

1.549 μ m as the pump source. However, intra-cavity pumping at 1.549 μ m did yield 1.634 μ m laser action in Er:YAG crystals ranging in concentration from 0.3% to 2 % and 1cm to 8cm in length.

Experimental Results

The Er:glass laser we used in this experiment consisted of a modified Quantronix model 210 power supply and laser head. The power supply was modified (by addition of extra capacitors in the pulse forming network) to produce 1.5ms long flash lamp pulses resulting in approximately 1.5ms long 1.549 μ m free running spiky outputs using an 80mm by 4mm diameter KIGRE Er:glass laser rod¹⁹. The close coupled single flash lamp laser cavity was modified to incorporate the KODAK White Reflectance Standard reflection coating in order to optimize flashlamp pump coupling in the Yb⁺³ and Nd⁺³ used as sensitizing co-dopants in the Er:glass rod. Our laser was air cooled because water cooling drastically reduced the output efficiency of the Er:glass laser. This is due to strong absorption of $\approx 1\mu$ m flashlamp radiation in water which reduces the excitation of Yb⁺³ resulting in a reduced Yb⁺³ to Er⁺³ energy transfer (a major excitation mechanism for Er⁺³, Yb⁺³ in glass). Hence, we operated the Yb,Er:glass laser at a low repetition rate (≈ 0.02 Hz).

The measured spectral response of the mirrors used in our intra-cavity pumping arrangement are shown in Figure 1. It can readily be observed that the higher reflectivity at $1.549\mu\text{m}$ ($R_{1.549\mu}=87\%$) versus $1.532\mu\text{m}$ ($R_{1.532\mu}=78\%$) resulted in the Er:glass laser wavelength shift to $1.549\mu\text{m}$. We achieved $1.549\mu\text{m}$ output power/energy close to those at the standard $1.532\mu\text{m}$ wavelength for the same flashlamp input level. Our Er:glass laser lased at two wavelengths simultaneously, regardless of which set of mirrors was used. Namely, when we utilized the $1.549\mu\text{m}$ mirrors, $1.549\mu\text{m}$ was the dominant wavelength in terms of output energies (approximately 40 times larger than the $1.532\mu\text{m}$ output). Conversely, when the standard $1.532\mu\text{m}$ mirrors were utilized, $1.532\mu\text{m}$ was the dominant wavelength with similar power ratios. It was demonstrated previously¹¹ that the Er:glass laser can oscillate at several different lines simultaneously provided it operates well above threshold.

We carried out a photoluminescence experiment on our Er:glass laser rod and the resulting spectra are shown in Figure 2 from which we note that the $1.549\mu\text{m}$ transition has approximately half the fluorescence intensity of the $1.532\mu\text{m}$ peak. It should be noted, however, that the gain ratio of the two competing transitions may not be proportional to their respective fluorescence intensity ratio due to different threshold inversion values (provided the transition linewidths are assumed equal). Our $1.549\mu\text{m}$ mirrors favored the $1.549\mu\text{m}$ transition, while

suppressing the inherently stronger competing 1.532 μm transition.

Absorption measurements of Er:YAG using the 1.549 μm Er:glass laser output (see Figure 3) were performed. The pulse to pulse energy stability of our Er:glass laser was better than 95%. The small signal absorption coefficient (per unit percent of Er concentration) was $\alpha_{1.549\mu\text{m}}=0.059\text{cm}^{-1}$. We repeated the absorption measurements with an Er:YAG crystal inside the Er:glass laser cavity. The absorption measurements showed the same value for $\alpha_{1.549\mu\text{m}}$, indicating that the 1.549 μm Er:glass laser wavelength remained unchanged.

Wavelength determinations using a Jarrell Ash 0.25m monochromator for measuring the Er:glass wavelength with and without an Er:YAG crystal inside the cavity confirmed the above results. This is similar to the results of Anthon and Pier¹⁵ who noted that the insertion of the Er:glass intra-cavity load into their Nd:YAG laser did not produce a wavelength shift in the Nd:YAG laser. In our case the lack of a wavelength shift, following the introduction of an IC Er:YAG load, can partially be explained with the aid of the Er:YAG absorption spectra (dashed curve) of Figure 4 (absorption spectra were obtained using a Varian CARY model 2415 spectrophotometer). Namely, since the 1.549 μm line already lies well off of any sharp Er:YAG resonances, there is no strong selective loss which would otherwise force a shift in the laser oscillation wavelength. It should be noted that the magnitude of the 1.532 μm energy in the Er:glass laser output was

sufficiently small (about 0.025 the strength of the 1.549 μ m output) such that it did not significantly affect the absorption measurements at the 1.549 μ m wavelength.

The Er:glass output wavelength shifts slightly depending on the voltage input to the flashlamp. Our measurements showed that a power supply input change of 30J (from 45J to 75J) shifted the peak of the Er:glass laser emission by approximately 3nm (from 1.535 μ m to 1.532 μ m when the standard 1.532 μ m mirrors were used). Since a similar shift was observed near the 1.549 μ m output when the 1.549 μ m mirrors were used, the power supply input to the flashlamp was kept fixed at 75J and the 1.549 μ m output was attenuated using a neutral density filter wheel for the absorption measurements. This insured that the Er:glass output wavelength remained fixed.

The intra-cavity lasing experimental arrangement is shown in Figure 5. The Er:YAG crystals (supplied by Scientific Materials Co.²⁰, and Union Carbide Corp.²¹) all lased at 1.634 μ m using the configuration of Figure 5. All crystals were polished flat-flat and uncoated. Fixing the pump at the input level of 75J corresponding to that used for all the external absorption measurements facilitated a quantitative comparison of energy absorbed in the Er:YAG crystals pumped intra-cavity. However, our Er:glass laser was operated near its maximum stable output, thus, we were unable to obtain data at a higher power input. The temporal 1.634 μ m laser signal together with the 1.549 μ m pump laser signal is shown in Figure 6. It should be noted that the

intensity of the 1.549 μ m signal was much stronger than the 1.634 μ m such that the 1.549 μ m monitoring detector did not require a notch filter.

The threshold energies were obtained from the temporally resolved integrated 1.549 μ m Er:glass laser pulse and the corresponding 1.634 μ m laser onset delays. The integration was achieved digitally utilizing an HP 54510A digitizing oscilloscope interfaced to an IBM XT computer. A typical spiked laser output and the corresponding integrated pulse is shown in Figure 7. At the fixed 75J power supply input, the available 1.549 μ m energy in the absence of any IC load was 150mJ. Hence, the temporally integrated 1.549 μ m pulse provided an accurate determination of how much energy is delivered at any point in time. The energy absorbed was then determined fractionally from the temporally integrated signals and the total energies absorbed in the crystals as determined from equation 3 in the Theoretical Analysis section. These results are listed in Table 1 for the four Er:YAG crystals utilized in these experiments.

Direct measurement of the 1.634 μ m energy was difficult because of the relative spectral closeness of the 1.549 μ m and the 1.634 μ m outputs in the presence of the much stronger 1.549 μ m signal. Direct 1.634 μ m energy measurement would require a notch filter with an exceptionally high (>200) 1.634 μ m to 1.549 μ m rejection ratio. Our notch filter had a 1.634 μ m to 1.549 μ m rejection ratio of approximately 40, thus, it only

partially attenuated the $1.549\mu\text{m}$ signal. Therefore, the strength of the $1.634\mu\text{m}$ signal was determined indirectly by the use of the monochromator-detector combination calibrated with the outside cavity $1.532\mu\text{m}$ pumped $1.645\mu\text{m}$ Er:YAG laser⁸. These results are listed in Table 1.

The 1% and 2% 1cm long Er:YAG crystals lased in the intra-cavity pumping configuration in the absence of the 15cm focal length lens. The longer crystals (3.8cm and 8cm), however, could not be made to lase without the lens. The data of Table 1 lists our results. The threshold values for the 1cm long crystals are in reasonable agreement with theory, whereas the measured values for the longer crystals are several times larger than the theoretical estimates. This is most likely due to the variation of the $1.549\mu\text{m}$ pumping filament diameter of a longer Er:YAG crystal versus a shorter one.

Burn spot measurements (on Polaroid 667 film) of the focused $1.532\mu\text{m}$ Er:glass laser beam (outside the cavity with the $1.532\mu\text{m}$ flat-flat mirror set, using our 15cm focal length lens) yielded a Full Width Half Maximum (FWHM) spot size of $\approx 800\mu$. We then measured the diameter of the beam just outside the output coupler with the $1.549\mu\text{m}$ mirror set (semi-confocal cavity) and obtained a FWHM of $\approx 600\mu\text{m}$. Using this technique, and from the relative f# change (from 2mm diameter non-focused beam to $800\mu\text{m}$ focused beam) of our 15 cm lens (empirically determined), we estimated the size of the focused spot in the intra-cavity Er:YAG crystal to be approximately $240\mu\text{m}$.

From Table 1 we note that the intra-cavity $1.634\mu\text{m}$ Er:YAG laser action was achieved with a minimum product of the absorption coefficient and crystal length of $\alpha L=0.059$ (1cm long 1% Er:YAG crystal). Although the 0.5% Er:YAG 1cm long crystal lased with the highest efficiency when pumped outside cavity by the $1.532\mu\text{m}$ ($\alpha_{1.532\mu\text{m}}=1\text{cm}^{-1}$) Er:Glass laser⁸, it did not lase at all in the intra-cavity pumping configuration. With an $\alpha L_{1.549\mu}=0.03$, there was insufficient absorption in the 0.5% Er:YAG 1cm long crystal to lase intra-cavity. This result was predicted by our theoretical threshold calculations for lasing crystals with the same parameters.

We achieved IC laser action in a 8cm long 0.5% Er:YAG crystal, although with low outputs. That is for the same pump inputs and lasing conditions, the IC $1.634\mu\text{m}$ laser action in the 8cm long 0.5% Er:YAG crystal manifested itself in a few spikes, barely operating above threshold. This crystal had the highest $\alpha L(=0.24)$, which introduced too much absorption for efficient intra-cavity operation.

Theoretical Analysis

The energy level diagram for Er:YAG at 300K is shown in Figure 8 showing the pump and lasing transitions for the intra-cavity (solid lines) and the external cavity (dashed lines) experiments together with the calculated Boltzmann factors. In comparing the $1.645\mu\text{m}$ and the $1.634\mu\text{m}$ transitions, one notes

that the Boltzmann factor inversion ratio is more favorable for the 1.645 μm ($\frac{y_3}{z_7} = 9.45$ versus 1.634 μm ($\frac{y_1}{z_6} = 7.75$).

Furthermore, the mirror spectral response (Figure 1) does not favor the 1.634 μm wavelength over the standard 1.645 μm .

However, as can be seen from the absorption spectra of Nd:glass (Figure 9), the 1.645 μm is lossier than 1.634 μm in terms of the relative absorption by Nd³⁺ in the Er:glass laser rod. Hence, it is likely that the Nd³⁺, which is present as a co-dopant in the KIGRE Er:glass laser rod forces the Er:YAG crystals to lase at the 1.634 μm wavelength.

Following the treatment of Rabinovich et al¹⁶, we calculate the energy absorbed in the IC Er:YAG lasers from the small signal absorption coefficient, α , (measured outside the cavity to be $\alpha_{1.549\mu\text{m}} = 0.059\text{cm}^{-1}$, per unit % Er concentration)

$$E_{\text{abs}} = E_{\text{cav}} \{ (1 - e^{-\alpha L}) + r e^{-\alpha L} (1 - e^{-\alpha L}) + r^2 e^{-2\alpha L} (1 - e^{-\alpha L}) + r^3 e^{-3\alpha L} (1 - e^{-\alpha L}) + \dots \}, \quad (1)$$

which for $\alpha L \ll 1$ (coinciding with our regime) can be written as

$$E_{\text{abs}} \approx E_{\text{cav}} \{ \alpha L + \alpha L [1 - \alpha L] r + \alpha L ([1 - \alpha L] r)^2 + \alpha L ([1 - \alpha L] r)^3 + \dots \} \quad (2)$$

where E_{abs} is the total energy absorbed in the IC laser crystal for an infinite number of passes, E_{cav} is the total available pump energy in the cavity, and L is the crystal length. r is the effective output coupler reflectivity which includes all cavity losses (per pass) other than absorption in Er:YAG. For high reflectivities (small output coupling, $t=1-r \ll 1$) and low single pass absorption of the IC laser, equation (2) becomes

$$E_{abs} = E_{cav} \frac{\alpha L}{(1-r+\alpha L)} = E_{cav} \frac{\alpha L}{(t+\alpha L-t\alpha L)}, \quad (3)$$

which can be approximated as

$$E_{abs} \approx E_{cav} \frac{\alpha L}{(\alpha L + t)} \quad (4)$$

where t here represents all cavity losses per pass (including the output coupling losses) with the exception of Er:YAG absorption, αL . These losses include bulk and surface scattering, and diffraction. We measured the $1.549\mu\text{m}$ reflection losses at the Er:YAG surfaces to be $\approx 10\%$ (which agrees with the theoretically predicted value (using the refractive index, $n=1.82$) of 9% , thus giving $\delta=0.17$.(our Er:YAG crystals were not AR coated).

Assuming negligible diffraction and bulk scattering losses we calculated the total energy absorbed in the IC Er:YAG crystals to be: $E_{abs} = 22.4, 44.3, 42.4,$ and 51 mJ for crystals 1 through 4 respectively, where we used the theoretical lasing threshold absorbance values, αL , in these calculations. These values were then used to obtain the experimental threshold energies (see Table 1). As mentioned earlier, the power supply input was kept constant at 75J providing a constant $E_{cav}=150$ mJ in the absence of any IC load.

The analysis of the lasing efficiency in an intra-cavity pumping configuration is difficult because of the non-linear pumping process of the Er:YAG crystals. However, we estimated the pumping efficiency using conventional laser theory outlined below. The expression for the output intensity as a function of the input in the small output coupling approximation is²²

$$I_{out} = \frac{I_s T}{2} \left(\frac{2\gamma L}{T + \delta} - 1 \right) \quad (5)$$

where $I_s = \frac{h\nu}{\sigma\tau}$ is the saturation intensity, T is the output coupler transmittance, γ is the small signal gain coefficient, L is the crystal length, σ is the stimulated emission cross-section, τ is the upper level lifetime, and δ represents additional cavity losses per round trip. Since our IC laser operated in a quasi-cw mode during the duration of the pump pulse, equation (5) is applicable

to our case. Differentiating (5) with respect to T and setting it to zero allows one to calculate the optimum output coupling, T_{opt} , such that the output intensity is a maximum. Performing this calculation yields

$$T_{opt} = \delta \left(\sqrt{\frac{2\gamma L}{\delta}} - 1 \right) \quad (6)$$

Using this analysis, Rabinovich et al¹⁶ modified relation (6) to give the optimum absorption in an I/C laser as ²³

$$\alpha L_{opt} = t \left(\sqrt{\frac{g}{t}} - 1 \right) \quad (7)$$

where t , as before, represents all the losses in the cavity (including the output coupling) except for the Er:YAG absorption, and g is the small signal gain defined as

$$g = 2\gamma L, \quad (8)$$

where the small signal gain coefficient, $\gamma = \sigma \Delta N_{th}$, σ being the stimulated emission cross-section and ΔN_{th} the threshold inversion density. From Er:YAG fluorescence

spectra (Figure 4: solid curve) and the previously determined²⁴ 1.645 μ m stimulated emission cross-section, we calculated the 1.634 μ m stimulated emission cross-section to be $1 \times 10^{-20} \text{ cm}^2$. Then, from the threshold inversion densities corresponding to cavity losses of $T=0.05$ and $\delta=0.17$, we calculated the optimum absorption coefficient-crystal length product to be $\alpha L^{\text{opt}}_{1.549\mu\text{m}}=0.0875$.

In order to compare the experimentally determined thresholds with the theoretically calculated ones we proceeded as follows: the threshold for laser action is approximately given by

$$R_1 R_2 e^{2(L\Delta N\sigma - \delta)} = 1 \quad (9)$$

where R_1, R_2 are the mirror reflectivities, ΔN is the population inversion, σ is the stimulated emission cross section, L is the crystal length and δ represents losses in addition to the output mirror. δ includes surface and bulk scattering losses per pass. Solving for ΔN_{th} gives

$$\Delta N_{\text{th}} = \frac{\delta}{\sigma L} + \frac{1}{2L\sigma} \ln\left(\frac{1}{R_1 R_2}\right). \quad (10)$$

Then, since the 1.634 μ m laser action occurs between the Stark levels y1 and z6, we can write the threshold condition as

$$N_{y1} - N_{z6} = \Delta N_{th}, \quad (11)$$

where the Stark levels are defined in terms of the total manifold populations (y: $^4I_{13/2}$, z: $^4I_{15/2}$) as

$$N_{y1} = \frac{f_{y1}}{Z_y} N_y, \quad N_{z6} = \frac{f_{z6}}{Z_z} N_z \quad (12)$$

f_{y1} , and f_{z6} are the appropriate Boltzmann factors (see Figure 8) and the partition functions are:

$$Z_{y,z} = \sum_{i=1}^{(7,8)} e^{-\frac{\Delta E_i}{kT}} \quad (13)$$

Thus, using (12) we calculated the population densities, N_y and N_z at threshold and assuming that each excited ion in $^4I_{13/2}$ represented one absorbed 1.549 μ m photon, we calculated the energy required to reach threshold (using corresponding pumped volumes in each crystal). This assumption is valid because the

$^4I_{13/2}$ lifetime ($\approx 7\text{ms}$) is long compared to $\approx 200\mu\text{s}$ required to reach threshold. In these calculations, δ was set at the previously determined value of 0.17 (assuming only surface reflection losses), and using the Boltzmann factors (Figure 8), and the mirror reflectivity values (Figure 1), the threshold inversion density was calculated from $\Delta N_{\text{th}} = \frac{1.95 \times 10^{19}}{L} \text{ cm}^{-3}$. The resulting calculated thresholds are listed in Table 1.

The results of Table 1, indicate reasonably good agreement between the absolute values of the calculated versus the experimentally determined threshold values for the 1cm long crystals (1 and 2). The large discrepancy in the theoretical versus experimental threshold values for the long crystals (3 and 4) was attributed to an increased spatial inhomogeneity of the pumped volume in the long ($L \gg 1\text{cm}$) crystals. Namely, our estimate of the pumped volume was too small.

Conclusions

Laser action in Er:YAG at 1.634 μ m pumped in an intra-cavity configuration by an Er:glass laser operating at 1.549 μ m is reported. The selective 1.634 μ m lasing (over the 1.645 μ m) is most likely due to higher absorption of the 1.645 μ m wavelength by the Nd co-dopant in the Er:glass rod, and is probably unique in this IC pumping arrangement. The Er:glass laser was shown to work efficiently at the shifted 1.549 μ m wavelength (a new wavelength in Er:glass) by utilization of cavity mirrors with suitable reflectivity spectra.

Acknowledgements

We thank Mr. John D. Myers, president of Kigre Inc., for the generous gift of the Er, Yb:phosphate glass laser rods used in this work.

The authors are grateful to Ralph Hutchinson of Scientific Materials Co. for supplying us with the 1cm long crystals of Er:YAG.

The authors are grateful to Milan Kokta of Union Carbide Corp. for supplying us with the long (3.8-8cm) Er,Yb:YAG laser rods.

References

1. Z.J.Kiss and R.C.Duncan Jr. , "Optical Maser Action in $\text{CaWO}_4:\text{Er}^{+3}$ " Proc. IRE **50**,1531 (1962)
2. S.A.Pollack, "Stimulated Emission in $\text{CaF}_2:\text{Er}^{+3}$ ", Proc. IEEE **51**,1793-1794 (1963)
3. W.F.Krupke and J.B.Gruber, "Energy Levels of Er^{+3} in LaF_3 and coherent emission at 1.61μ ", J.Chem. Phys.**41**(5),1225-1232 (1964)
4. L.F.Johnson, J.E.Geusic and L.G.VanUitert, "Coherent Oscillations from Tm^{+3} , Ho^{+3} , Yb^{+3} , and Er^{+3} , ions in Yttrium Aluminum Garnet", Appl.Phys.Lett. **7**(5),127-129(1965)
5. K.O.White and S.A.Schleusener, "Coincidence of Er:YAG laser emission with methane absorption at 1645.1nm ", Appl.Phys.Lett. **21**,419-420 (1972)

6. G.Huber, E.W.Duczynski, and K.Petermann, "Laser pumping of Ho-, Tm-, Er-doped Garnet lasers at room temperature", IEEE J.Quant. Electron. **24**(6),920-923 (1988)
7. H.Stange, K.Petermann, G.Huber, and E.W.Duczynski, "Continuous wave 1.6 μ laser action in Er-doped garnets at room temperature", Appl.Phys.B **49**,269-273 (1989)
8. K.Spariosu and M. Birnbaum, "Room temperature 1.645 micron Er:YAG lasers", OSA Proc. on Advanced Solid-State Lasers, Feb.17-19, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 127-130 (1992).
9. G.M.Zverev, V.M.Garmash, A.M.Onishchenko, V.A.Pashkov, A.A.Semenov, Yu.M.Kolbatskov, and A.I.Smirnov, "Induced emission by trivalent erbium ions in crystals of yttrium-aluminum garnet", J.Appl.Spectrosc.(USSR), **21**,1467-1469(1974).
10. A.A.Kaminskii, "Laser Crystals", 2nd. ed. (Springer-Verlag, New-York, 1990) pg.143.

11. V.P.Gapontsev, M.E.Zhabotinskii, A.A.Izyneev, V.B. Kravchenko, and Yu.P.Rudnitskii, "Effective 1.054-1.54 μ stimulated emission conversion", JETP Lett. **18**,251-253 (1973)
12. V.N.Kalinin, A.A.Mak, D.S.Prilezhaev, and V.A.Fromzel' "Lasing properties of Yb⁺³ and Er⁺³ glass laser pumped by a laser", Sov.Phys.Tech.Phys. **19**(6),835-836(1974)
13. A.G.Murzin and V.A.Fromzel', "Maximum gains of laser-pumped glasses activated.with Yb⁺³ and Er⁺³ ions", Sov.J.Quantum Electron. **11**(3),304-308 (1981)
14. R.G.Aubakirov, A.G.Murzin, and V.A.Fromzel, "Raising the efficiency of intracavity laser pumping of selectively absorbing media", Opt.Spectrosc.(USSR) **55**(3),295-298 (1983)
15. D.W.Anthon and T.J.Pier, "Diode-pumped Erbium glass lasers", SPIE Proc. Solid-State Lasers III (1992), pg.8-12.
16. W.S.Rabinovich, S.R.Bowman, B.J.Feldman, and M.J.Winings, "Tunable Laser pumped 3 μ Ho:YAlO₃ laser", IEEE J.Quantum Electron. **27**(4),895-897 (1991)

17. S.R.Bowman and B.J.Feldman, "Demonstration and analysis of a Ho quasi-two level laser", SPIE Proc. Solid-State Lasers III (1992), pg.46-54.
18. R.C.Stoneman and L.Esterowitz, "Intracavity-pumped 2.09 μ Ho:YAG laser", Opt.Lett. 17(10), 736-738(1992).
19. P.W.Milonni and J.E.Eberly, "Lasers" (J.Wiley and Sons, New York,1988), pg.324.
20. A.Siegman, "Lasers", University Science Books (Mill Valley, CA, 1986),pgs.477-479.
21. D.K.Killinger, "Phonon-assisted upconversion in 1.64 μ Er:YAG lasers", LEOS Digest of Tech. Papers, Apr.26,1987, pg.240.

Figure Captions

Table 1. Intra Cavity 1.549 μ m pumped 1.634 μ m Er:YAG laser performance.

Figure 1. Output coupler (mirror B1) spectrally resolved reflectivity.

Figure 2. KIGRE Er:glass laser rod photoluminescence spectra.

Figure 3. Experimental arrangement for absorption measurements.

Figure 4. Er:YAG absorption (dashed curve) and photoluminescence (solid curve) spectra.

Figure 5. Intra-cavity laser pumped lasing arrangement.

Figure 6. Temporal 1.634 μ m laser signal relative to the 1.549 μ m pump signal (horizontal scale: 200 μ s per division; vertical scale: arbitrary).

Figure 7. Free-running and the corresponding temporally integrated Er:glass laser outputs.

Figure 8. Energy level diagram for Er:YAG (300K).

Figure 9. Nd:glass absorption spectra.




Figure 1: Output coupler (mirror B1) spectrally resolved reflectivity




Figure 2: KIGRE Er:glass laser rod photoluminescence spectra




Figure 3. Experimental arrangement for absorption measurements




Figure 4. Er:YAG absorption (dashed curve) and photoluminescence (solid curve) spectra





Figure 5. Intra-cavity laser pumped lasing arrangement



1.549 μ m

Crystal 1

1% Er:YAG

(L=1cm)

1.634 μ m

Figure 6. Temporal 1.634 μ m laser signal with the relevant 1.549 μ m pump signal (horizontal scale: 200 μ m per division; vertical scale: arbitrary).




Figure 7: Free running and the corresponding temporally integrated Er:glass laser outputs




Figure 9: Nd:glass absorption spectra

TABLE I. INTRA-CAVITY 1.549 μ m PUMPED 1.634 μ m Er:YAG LASER PERFORMANCE

Er:YAG Crystal	Er [%]	Length [cm]	$(\alpha L)^0_{1.549\mu m}$	$(\alpha L)^{th}_{1.549\mu m}$	Experimental E_{th} [mJ] ratio	Theoretical E_{th} [mJ] ratio	1.634 μ m output [mJ]
1	1	1	0.06	0.039	4.5 1.0	2.89 1.0	1.6
2	2	1	0.12	0.092	6.2 1.38	3.78 1.308	1
3	0.5	3.8	0.114	0.087	22.6 5.02	3.70 1.28	4
4	0.3	8	0.144	0.114	28 6.22	4.14 1.43	3.2

Er³⁺:Y₃Al₅O₁₂ Laser Dynamics: Effects of Upconversion

by:

Kalin Spariosu, and Milton Birnbaum

University of Southern California

Center for Laser Studies

University Park, DRB B17

Los Angeles, CA 90089-1112,

and

Bruno Viana

Lab. de Chimie Appl. de l'Etat Solide

Universite Pierre et Marie Curie

Ecole Nationale Supérieure de Chimie de Paris

11, rue Pierre et Marie Curie

75231 Paris Cedex 05, France

ABSTRACT

Room temperature $1.532\mu\text{m}$ pumped 1.645μ laser action in the $\text{Er}^{3+}:\text{Y}_3\text{Al}_5\text{O}_{12}$ (Er:YAG) $^4\text{I}_{13/2} \rightarrow ^4\text{I}_{15/2}$ ($6602\text{cm}^{-1} \Rightarrow 523\text{cm}^{-1}$) transition was demonstrated and analyzed. Laser action at $1.645\mu\text{m}$ was achieved in Er:YAG crystals with Er concentrations ranging from 0.5% to 4%. Slope efficiencies as high as 40% were obtained with 0.5% Er:YAG. For concentrations up to 4% measurements of laser thresholds indicated that upconversion losses were small.

INTRODUCTION

The first $1.6\mu\text{m}$ $^4I_{13/2}$ - $^4I_{15/2}$ laser action was demonstrated in Er:CaWO_4^1 . Laser action in Er:CaF_2^2 , and in Er:LaF_3^3 near $1.6\mu\text{m}$ for both crystals was subsequently reported. Flash lamp pumping at 77K was utilized in all cases. The first $1.645\mu\text{m}$ $^4I_{13/2}$ - $^4I_{15/2}$ laser action in Er:YAG was achieved by Johnson et al⁴ at 77K, and later at room temperature by White and Schleusener⁵, again using flash lamp excitation in both cases. More recently, CW oscillation at $1.645\mu\text{m}$ in Er:YAG was achieved using a Kr ion laser at $0.647\mu\text{m}$ in an end pumping arrangement^{6,7}. We reported $1.532\mu\text{m}$ pumped $1.645\mu\text{m}$ Er:YAG lasers at 300K using an Er:glass laser as the pump source in an end pumped configuration⁸. All of the above reported Er:YAG lasers at 300K oscillated in the $^4I_{13/2}:Y3(6602\text{cm}^{-1}) \Rightarrow ^4I_{15/2}:Z7(523\text{cm}^{-1})$ transition at $1.645\mu\text{m}$. Zverev et al⁹ reported on a flash-lamp pumped $1.632 \pm 2\mu\text{m}$ Er:YAG laser action at 300K. The authors did not discuss mechanisms for this shift from the standard $1.645\mu\text{m}$ laser line.

The recent revival of interest in the Er lasers at $1.6\mu\text{m}$ stems from the desirability of eye-safe lasers operating within an atmospheric window and, thus, potentially useful for atmospheric sounding and numerous other applications. A diode pumped version would have the advantages of high efficiency, reliability, and compactness. Killinger studied the potential

capability of the 1% Er:YAG 1.64 μ m laser utilizing pumping at 1.47 μ m. Killinger found a much higher threshold than that predicted theoretically and reached a preliminary conclusion that upconversion losses were the primary factor. To resolve this potential problem, we studied upconversion effects in Er:YAG crystals and obtained detailed threshold measurements to identify possible upconversion losses. It is well known that upconversion via cooperative non-radiative energy transfer is an important mechanism for the excitation of upper lying energy levels of rare earth ions in crystalline hosts, particularly for high dopant concentrations. There are several excellent review articles on this topic^{10,11,12}. In Er³⁺:crystals and glasses, the cooperative energy transfer is a major excitation mechanism for achieving laser action from the upper lying states. In fact, upconversion pumped laser action was achieved using 1.5 μ m excitation through both di-ionic^{13,14,15} and tri-ionic^{16,17,18} energy transfer (see Figure 1). In the low concentration regime, $\leq 4\%$, only ion pair upconversion processes need be considered in Er³⁺:YAG.

Recent work¹⁹ supports our results that for low concentrations of Er in YAG upconversion losses are low. McFarlane et al. showed that in 5% Er:YLF the pair upconversion loss contribution from the ⁴I_{13/2} level is about 4%. Measurements on Er:YAG by McFarlane et al.¹⁹ were taken only for 33%Er:YAG. However, if we utilize the results obtained by

Zhekov et al.²⁰, we find that the upconversion losses in 5%Er:YAG would be no greater than that reported for 5%Er:YLF.

Our focus in this work was to demonstrate by detailed measurements of low concentration Er:YAG lasers and theoretical analysis of our results that the Er:YAG laser performance was consistent with small upconversion losses. Our results for the laser thresholds showed good agreement with theoretical modeling where we assumed no upconversion losses. Only the 0.5% Er:YAG laser operated with high slope efficiency. We believe that the lower slope efficiencies observed with the higher Er concentration Er:YAG lasers could have been caused by poor overlap of the pump and laser beams in our end-pumping arrangement.

EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

The Er:glass laser we used in this experiment consisted of a modified Quantronix model 210 power supply and laser head. The original pulse forming network (PFN) of the Quantronix power supply provided approximately a 1ms long flash lamp pulse resulting in a free-running (spiking) 1.532 μ m output approximately 1ms in duration from a 4mm DIA x 80mm long KIGRE QE7 Er:glass laser rod. The PFN consisted of six 30 μ f capacitors for a total of 180 μ f. The Er:glass laser resonator consisted of two plane parallel mirrors. The transmittance of the output coupler ($T \approx 15\%$) was practically constant over a 50nm wavelength range centered at 1.53 μ m. Energy output performance at 1.532 μ m is shown in Figure 2. This power supply (with the 180 μ f PFN) was used as the pump source in the upconversion fluorescence measurements.

The power supply was subsequently modified (by the addition of 90 μ f to the PFN) to produce 1.5ms long flash lamp pulses resulting in approximately 1.5ms long free running spiky 1.532 μ m outputs where most of the energy is concentrated in the relatively flat first 1ms of the pulse. The close coupled single flash lamp laser cavity was modified to incorporate the KODAK White Reflectance Standard reflection coating in order to optimize flashlamp pump coupling in the Yb⁺³ and Nd⁺³ used as sensitizing co-dopants in the Er:glass rod. Our laser was air cooled because water cooling drastically reduced the output

efficiency of the Er:glass laser. This is due to strong absorption of $\approx 1\mu\text{m}$ flashlamp radiation in water which reduces the excitation of Yb^{+3} resulting in a reduced Yb^{+3} to Er^{+3} energy transfer (a major excitation mechanism for Er^{+3} , Yb^{+3} in glass). Thus, we could operate the Yb,Er:glass laser only at a low repetition rate ($\approx 0.02\text{ Hz}$).

It was demonstrated previously¹⁹ that the Er:glass laser can oscillate at several different lines simultaneously provided it operates well above threshold. Our laser, which utilized a KIGRE QE-7 phosphate glass, lased at two wavelengths simultaneously: $1.532\mu\text{m}$ and $1.549\mu\text{m}$. However, the $1.532\mu\text{m}$ wavelength was dominant with approximately 40 times greater output energy than the $1.549\mu\text{m}$ wavelength. Wavelength measurements of our Er:glass laser were carried out using a Jarrell-Ash 82-497 monochromator. The Er:glass output wavelength shifted slightly depending on the voltage input to the flashlamp. Measurements showed that a power supply input change of 30J (from 45J to 75J) shifted the peak of the Er:glass laser emission by as much as 3nm (from 1535nm to 1532nm). Therefore, when carrying out absorption bleaching measurements, the power supply input to the flashlamp was kept fixed at 75J in order to insure that the Er:glass output wavelength remained fixed.

The spectral absorption data were obtained with a Varian CARY model 2415 spectrophotometer and digitally stored in an IBM PC allowing us to transfer it to a MacIntosh computer for

plotting. The absorption spectra obtained for 1%Er:YAG is shown in Figure 3. There is some absorption at the 1.645 μ m laser wavelength which is expected from the population of the lower level at room temperature. However, this absorption is small compared to the absorption at 1532nm. The small signal absorption coefficient at 1.532 μ m, $\alpha(1\%Er)=1\text{cm}^{-1}$, was determined using the Er:glass laser at 1.532 μ m as the pump, and was confirmed by the CARY measured value (Figure 3). Thus, for a sample length of 1cm, $\alpha L=1$ for 1%Er:YAG at 1.532 μ m.

Absorption (and bleaching) measurements using the Er:glass laser source were performed using the experimental arrangement of Figure 4. The energy meter used was Scientech 365 (and in some instances, Laser Precision RJ7200). The attenuation of the Er:glass laser beam was achieved without compromising its spectral and temporal integrity by the utilization of a calibrated neutral density filter wheel. The absorption bleaching measurements were computed using the definition of the time integrated (total) absorption coefficient as
$$\alpha = \frac{\ln(\frac{E_{out}}{E_{in}})}{L}$$
 (absorbance= αL). Figure 5 shows the bleaching results. The observed bleaching agrees well with the theoretical models.

In order to temporally resolve the amount of energy absorbed during the duration of the pump pulse, we carried out a modified bleaching experiment where we monitored the input

and the output pulses to the sample simultaneously using an identical pair of detectors. The digitized spiking signals were subsequently numerically integrated in the IBM PC by simply adding consecutive data points. The result is a temporally resolved increasing energy as a function of time. An example of spiking and the corresponding integrated signals is shown in Figure 6.

Our photoluminescence data was obtained using a computer controlled Jarrell-Ash Czerny-Turner 1m scanning spectrometer interfaced to an IBM PC where the fluorescence data was digitally stored. This allowed for computer graphics plotting using a MacIntosh computer (similar to the absorption data processing). The detection was achieved with a North Coast Scientific EO817L cooled Ge detector, while the excitation was done with a chopped output from a LEXEL Model 95 Argon Ion laser at 514nm. Photoluminescence spectra for Er:YAG is shown in Figure 3. The 1.645 μ m laser emission peak is clearly identified in Figure 3.

The upconversion fluorescence data was obtained utilizing the experimental arrangement of Figure 7. The exit slit of the Jarrell-Ash 82-497 monochromator was interfaced with a Hamamatsu R632 photomultiplier tube (PMT) with an S1 photocathode. This enabled us to detect fluorescence in the visible wavelength range as well as near infrared emission \leq 1 μ m. The 1.532 μ m pump reference was detected simultaneously using an InAs detector. Signals from both the

PMT and the InAs detector were recorded using a Tektronix 7844 dual beam oscilloscope.

We monitored upconversion fluorescence from 4 different transitions in Er:YAG: $^4I_{11/2}$ - $^4I_{15/2}$ (980nm), $^4F_{9/2}$ - $^4I_{15/2}$ (670nm), $^4S_{3/2}$ - $^4I_{15/2}$ (550nm), and $^2H_{9/2}$ - $^4I_{15/2}$ (410nm). Figure 8 shows the temporal correlation between the input 1.532 μ m pulse and the corresponding 980nm signal (the initial bump is some leakage of flash lamp light). All of the spectrally and time resolved upconversion fluorescence traces were obtained using the monochromator. Intensity curves were not corrected for the different wavelength responses of the spectrometer and the different neutral density filters employed. When viewing spectrally integrated fluorescence in the absence of a monochromator and using a Si detector, the 980nm signal was the dominant in intensity (as expected). The 980nm upconversion fluorescence is shown in Figure 8 for different Er doping concentrations in YAG.

The upconversion build up time is roughly 600 μ s; namely, the peak upconversion fluorescence occurs about 600 μ s after the onset of the 1.532 μ m pump radiation. (The decay time after the cessation of the 1.532 μ m pump pulse is governed by the inherent lifetimes of the respective energy levels in Er:YAG). In our Er:YAG laser experiments threshold occurred usually about 200 μ s after the onset of the pump radiation implying lower upconversion losses as compared to those corresponding to peak fluorescence intensities shown in Figure 8. In subsequent

sections of this paper, we show that the observed laser oscillation thresholds for <4%Er:YAG lasers are in good agreement with the theoretically predicted thresholds, where upconversion losses are excluded from the calculations.

The characterization of the 1.532 μ m end-pumped Er:YAG laser emission at 1.645 μ m involved temporal output measurements, as well as the direct measurement of the total 1.645 μ m energy for a given 1.532 μ m input. The Er:glass pump laser operated single-shot at a low repetition rate (≈ 0.02 Hz) and its output was a series of pulselets, (spikes) characteristic of free-running solid-state lasers. Therefore, it was necessary to simultaneously monitor the temporal 1.532 μ m input trace, the 1.645 μ m laser output trace, and the energy transmitted through the sample.

The experimental arrangement for the temporal 1.645 μ m laser diagnostics is shown in Figure 9. The input to the sample was determined by measuring the transmittance of each optical component, inclusion of the surface reflection losses, and by calibrating the neutral density filters prior to carrying out the experiment. In order to separate the 1.645 μ m output from the stronger Er:glass pump at 1.532 μ m, a notch filter (1.532 μ m to 1.645 μ m rejection ratio of 60 to 1) was used. The 1.645 μ m signal was sampled out of output coupler ($T \approx 5\%$ at 1.645 μ m), counter-propagating with respect to the 1.532 μ m pump. Furthermore, the small reflection ($R \approx 10\%$) at 1.532 μ m from the 1.645 μ m output coupler provided for a higher 1.645 μ m to

1.532 μ m rejection ratio than would be available with $T \approx 50\%$ at 1.532 μ m of the 100% 1.645 μ m reflector in a co-propagating signal detection mode. All the laser resonator mirrors utilized in this experiment were plane-parallel with radius of curvature, $R_C \approx \infty$.

The power supply of the Er:glass laser was kept at a fixed input in order to maintain the temporal and spectral integrity of the 1.532 μ m pump pulse. The temporal 1.532 μ m and the 1.645 μ m lasing traces were recorded with an HP 54510A digitizing oscilloscope which we interfaced to an IBM PC enabling us to digitally store the temporal trace data. Figure 10 shows an example of 1.532 μ m pumped 1.645 μ m Er:YAG laser results. Pumping was done with a QE7 KIGRE Er:glass laser rod having an active area of 3mm diameter surrounded by a 0.5mm thick UV absorbing cladding material, thus making up a 4mm diameter total. The 1.532 μ m output beam had relatively poor mode quality judging from the unfocused burn spot, typically measuring 2mm across. The burn spot at the focal point of the 15cm bi-convex lens measured approximately 700 μ m across , but having a more regular round transverse profile. The Polaroid 667 film gave reasonably reliable beam profiles confirming the computed pump surface area of $A \approx 0.003\text{cm}^2$.

Comparing the laser onset delay (LOD) from lasing traces such as those of Figure 10 for different Er concentrations but with similar energy inputs, we noted that LOD decreased with increasing Er concentration (for the same 1cm crystal length).

Furthermore, for a given Er concentration in YAG, the LOD increased as the pump energy decreased, which is as expected since a longer time is required to absorb sufficient pump energy to reach threshold.

The 1.645 μ m energy measurements were carried out using an experimental arrangement similar to that of Figure 9. The actual 1.645 μ m energy detected by the RJ7200 calorimeter was properly calibrated by the previously determined attenuation factors of the microscope slide at 45° incidence, and the notch filter. Both the Scientech 365 and the RJ7200 calorimeters were calibrated with the aid of an energy meter which had been carefully calibrated against standard sources. The residual 1.532 μ m light that made it through to the RJ7200 calorimeter was subtracted from the readings. Because of the inherently high rejection ratio of our arrangement, this 1.532 μ m background energy turned out to be $\leq 10\%$ of the 1.645 μ m energy. The energy measurements combined with temporal lasing traces enabled us to obtain input absorbed energy versus output data for the Er:YAG lasers.

The threshold energies and slope efficiencies were determined from lasing traces such as those in Figure 10 and the temporally resolved energy absorbed. Output versus input results for several Er:YAG crystals are shown in Figures 11. The Er:YAG crystals studied are listed in Table 1. The results for our measured laser thresholds were in good agreement with the

theoretical modeling which excluded upconversion losses and implied that upconversion should be small for these lasers.

TABLE I. 1.532 μ m PUMPED 1.645 μ m Er:YAG LASER PERFORMANCE

Er:YAG Crystal	Er [%]	Length [cm]	αL	threshold [mJ]		slope efficiency [%]
				experiment	calculated	
1	0.5	1	0.5	10	7	40
2	1	1	1	11	9	16
3	2	1	2	12	14	4.4
4	4	0.25	1	11	9	2.3

THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

Modified Franz-Nodvik (MFN) solution to the radiation transport equation

The solution of the radiation transport equation has been done by several authors^{20,21,22}. The review of some of these approaches has been done by Siegman²³. Avizonis and Grotbeck²² presented an analytical solution to the radiation transport equation with the inclusion of passive losses. In all of these cases, the underlying method of solving the radiation transport equation involves the compression of one of the (time or space) variables. The standard approach^{20,21,23} involves the compression of the spatial variable (along the propagation direction). The solution of the space compressed system as per Siegman²³, modified to include Stark energy level structure (see

Figure 12), proceeds as follows: The two coupled differential equations describing energy the propagation of an energy pulse (or wave) through an active two level medium are:

$$\frac{dI}{dz} = -\sigma I(f_1 N_L - f_2 N_u) \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{dN_u}{dt} = \frac{\sigma I}{h\nu} (f_1 N_L - f_2 N_u) \quad (2),$$

where N_L , N_u are the lower and the upper population densities respectively with the corresponding Boltzmann factors, f_1 and f_2 . The above two level model assumes no decay from the excited state, N_u , thus, giving an upper efficiency limit of a pulse propagating through an absorbing medium.

Numerical Integration Model (NIM) solution of the radiation transport equations including upconversion effects

The dominant method of upconversion excitation in Er^{+3} crystals is the ion-pair cooperative non-radiative excitation which is the major excitation mechanism for the $3\mu\text{m}$ Er lasers¹⁴. The relevant rate equations for the $1.5\mu\text{m}$ pumped $1.6\mu\text{m}$ Er laser (Figure 12), modified to include Stark energy level structure, are:

$$\frac{dN_1}{dt} = -\sigma S(f_1 N_1 - f_2 N_2) + \frac{N_2}{\tau_2} + \frac{N_3}{\tau_{31}} + \beta N_2^2 \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{dN_2}{dt} = \sigma S(f_1 N_1 - f_2 N_2) - \frac{N_2}{\tau_2} + \frac{N_3}{\tau_{32}} - 2\beta N_2^2 \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{dN_3}{dt} = -\frac{N_3}{\tau_3} + \beta N_2^2 \quad (5)$$

where $\frac{1}{\tau_3} = \frac{1}{\tau_{32}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{31}}$, N_1 , N_2 , and N_3 are the population densities of the $4I_{15/2}$, $4I_{13/2}$, and $4I_{11/2}$ levels respectively. σ , S , and β are the pump cross-section, the pump flux, and the ion-pair upconversion coefficient respectively. The pump flux is defined as $S = \frac{I_p}{h\nu_p}$ where I_p is the pump intensity and $h\nu_p$ is the pump photon energy. In our numerical calculations we used the following values for the Er^{3+} lifetimes: $\tau_2 \approx 7\text{ms}$, $\tau_{31} \approx 0.1\text{ms}$, and $\tau_{32} \approx 10\text{ms}$. The values for β were obtained from the empirically determined variation of the upconversion coefficient in Er:YAG as function of Er concentration²⁵. Equations (3-5) were numerically solved using the Runge-Kutta method.

The population inversion is defined as (with reference to Figure 12) as

$$\Delta N_0 = f_3 N_2 - f_4 N_1 = (f_3 + f_4) N_2 - f_4 N_t \quad (6)$$

(f_3 and f_4 are the Boltzmann factors for the laser levels). The threshold gain coefficient, γ_{th} , is determined as follows:

$$R_1 R_2 e^{2\sigma_L \Delta N L - \delta} = 1 \quad (7)$$

$$\sigma_L \Delta N_{th} = \gamma_{th} = \frac{1}{2L} \left[\delta + \ln\left(\frac{1}{R_1 R_2}\right) \right] \approx \frac{1}{2L} (\delta + T) \quad (8)$$

where δ is the round trip loss. The above expressions are valid for small output coupling, T . Using (6) and (8), we calculated the theoretical thresholds listed in Table 1.

DISCUSSION

Since the upper manifold lifetime of the absorbing (lasing medium: Er:YAG) was long compared to the pump pulse [$\tau(^4I_{13/2}) = 7\text{ms}$]¹⁸, and at low Er doping concentrations upconversion and other parasitic energy transfer losses were negligible, the MFN model showed good agreement with the experimental bleaching data (Figure 5). There we plotted

experimental and theoretical (dashed curves) absorption coefficient as a function of input energy. The NIM model was in slightly better agreement with the 2%Er:YAG experimental bleaching results, although there was not a significant deviation from the ideal MFN model. These results indicate that upconversion losses do not significantly affect the population inversion densities in our lasers.

The upconversion fluorescence results of Figure 8 showed that regardless of the lifetime of the level from where fluorescence originates, the evolution of the fluorescence was delayed (peaks) by $\geq 600\mu\text{s}$ with respect to the pump pulse onset. This supports our results which indicate that the laser thresholds, typically achieved within a $\approx 200\mu\text{s}$ delay with respect to the beginning of the pump pulse, would be minimally increased by upconversion losses.

From the temporally resolved energy absorbed plots we obtained the pump energy thresholds and the energy absorbed during lasing using the temporal lasing traces such those of Figure 10. The threshold energies and the energies absorbed during lasing were subsequently combined with the measured $1.645\mu\text{m}$ output energy for known $1.532\mu\text{m}$ inputs, allowing us to plot the input versus output data shown in Figures 11. In our calculations we used the previously determined²⁸ stimulated emission cross-section for Er:YAG at $1.645\mu\text{m}$ ($\sigma_{1.645\mu\text{m}} \approx 1.9 \times 10^{-20} \text{cm}^2$, also confirmed by our absorption measurements), with $\delta=0.05$ and $T=0.05$. The additional loss

term, $\delta \approx 0.05$, was determined from the estimated Fresnel losses in our resonator. Using this data we tabulated the experimentally determined and theoretically estimated thresholds, and the experimentally determined slope efficiencies for the Er:YAG lasers (see Table 1).

Table 1. 1.532 μ m pumped 1.645 μ m Er:YAG laser performance.

Er:YAG Crystal	Er [%]	Length [cm]	αL	threshold [mJ]		slope efficiency [%]
				experi- ment	calcu- lated	
1	0.5	1	0.5	10	7	40
2	1	1	1	11	9	16
3	2	1	2	12	14	4.4
4	4	0.25	1	11	9	2.3

From Table 1, we note the good agreement between our experimental measurements of laser thresholds and the theoretical estimates which did not include upconversion losses. This shows that Er(0.5-4%):YAG lasers should be operable with only small degradation due to upconversion. Additional evidence is shown in Figure 5. The good agreement between our theoretically estimated (NIM and MFN models) and experimentally determined absorption coefficients of the Er(0.5-2%):YAG samples at pumping levels exceeding those utilized in our laser experiments shows that low concentration Er:YAG lasers without deleterious effects of upconversion are feasible. The above results are consistent with the work of references [19] and [20] which show that pair upconversion losses from the

$4I_{13/2}$ level in $\text{Er}^{3+}(<4\%):$ crystals (such as YLF and YAG) are small and should not appreciably inhibit laser action.

The data in the last column of Table 1, which lists the slope efficiency of our Er:YAG lasers, shows a decreasing efficiency with increasing Er concentration. For the 0.5%Er:YAG the measured slope efficiency of $\approx 40\%$ is in good agreement with the theoretically deduced value of 45% where we assumed, as before, $\delta=T=0.05$. This is consistent with the theoretical calculations showing excellent agreement between theoretical and experimental thresholds (see Table 1). The observed progressively decreasing slope efficiencies of samples 2-4 is currently still under investigation.

The effect which could reduce our slope efficiencies for samples 2-4 (see Table 1), and which we believe responsible for the results obtained, is increasingly poorer overlap of the pump and laser beams with increasing Er concentration. A major contributing factor is that we are pumping longitudinally with an approximately Gaussian radial (transverse) intensity distribution. Thus, only the central portion of our Gaussian beam is effective in pumping the Er:YAG samples. This effect (which is most severe in quasi-three level lasers) becomes stronger for the more concentrated samples.

A closely related effect was observed in our work on saturable absorber Q-switches. When the saturable absorber Q-switch is inserted in the laser cavity, the diameter of the laser

beam is reduced by approximately a factor of two[29]. This effect could result in a drastic reduction of pump and laser mode overlap; however, further work is required and is in progress in order to clarify the Er(1-4%):YAG laser results.

CONCLUSIONS

The laser dynamics of 1.532 μ m pumped 1.645 μ m Er:YAG at 300K were studied and analyzed. Good agreement between the experimentally determined thresholds for Er(0.5-4%):YAG and theoretical estimates (which did not include upconversion losses) showed the feasibility of efficient laser operation. This was confirmed by the demonstration of a 40% slope efficiency Er(0.5%):YAG laser in a non-optimized laser cavity, in agreement with theoretical estimates.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors thank Mr. John D. Myers, president of Kigre Inc., for the generous gift of the Er, Yb:phosphate glass laser rods used in this work.

REFERENCES

1. Z. J. Kiss and R. C. Duncan Jr. , "Optical Maser Action in $\text{CaWO}_4:\text{Er}^{+3}$ " Proc. IRE **50**,1531 (1962)
2. S. A. Pollack, "Stimulated Emission in $\text{CaF}_2:\text{Er}^{+3}$ ", Proc. IEEE **51**,1793-1794 (1963)
3. W. F. Krupke and J. B. Gruber, "Energy Levels of Er^{+3} in LaF_3 and coherent emission at 1.61μ ", J.Chem. Phys.**41**(5),1225-1232 (1964)
4. L. F. Johnson, J. E. Geusic and L. G. VanUitert, "Coherent Oscillations from Tm^{+3} , Ho^{+3} , Yb^{+3} , and Er^{+3} , ions in Yttrium Aluminum Garnet", Appl.Phys.Lett. **7**(5),127-129(1965)
5. K. O. White and S. A. Schleusener, "Coincidence of Er:YAG laser emission with methane absorption at 1645.1nm ", Appl.Phys.Lett. **21**,419-420 (1972)
6. G. Huber, E. W. Duczynski, and K. Petermann, "Laser pumping of Ho-, Tm-, Er-doped Garnet lasers at room temperature", IEEE J.Quant. Electron. **24**(6),920-923 (1988)

7. H. Stange, K. Petermann, G. Huber, and E. W. Duczynski, "Continuous wave 1.6 μ laser action in Er-doped garnets at room temperature", *Appl.Phys.B* **49**,269-273 (1989)
8. K. Spariosu and M. Birnbaum, "Room temperature 1.645 micron Er:YAG lasers", *OSA Proc. on Advanced Solid-State Lasers*, Feb.17-19, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 127-130 (1992).
9. G. M. Zverev, V. M. Garmash, A. M. Onishchenko, V. A. Pashkov, A. A. Semenov, Yu. M. Kolbatskov, and A. I. Smirnov, "Induced emission by trivalent erbium ions in crystals of yttrium-aluminum garnet", *J.Appl.Spectrosc.(USSR)*, **21**,1467-1469(1974).
10. F. Auzel, "Materials and devices using double-pumped phosphors with energy transfer", *Proc. IEEE*, **61**(6), 758-786 (1973).
11. L. Riseberg and M. Weber, "Relaxation phenomena in rare-earth luminescence", in "Progress in optics XIV", ed. E.Wolf (North Holland, 1976), 92-159.
12. J. Wright, "Up-conversion and excited state energy transfer in rare-earth doped materials", in "Topics in Applied Physics," ed. F.K. Fong, Vol. 16 (Springer-Verlag, 1976), 239-295.
13. S. Pollack, D. Chang, and N. Moise, "Upconversion-pumped infrared erbium laser", *J.Appl.Phys.* **60**(12), 4077-4086 (1986).

14. S. Pollack and D. Chang, "Ion-pair upconversion pumped laser emission in Er^{3+} ions in YAG, YLF, SrF_2 , and CaF_2 crystals", *J.Appl.Phys.* **64**(6), 2885-2893 (1988).
15. P. Xie and S. Rand, "Continuous-wave, pair-pumped laser", *Opt. Lett.* **15**(15), 848-850 (1990).
16. P. Xie and S. Rand, "Continuous-wave, trio upconversion laser", *Appl.Phys.Lett.* **57**(12), 1182-1184 (1990).
17. S. Pollack, D. Chang, and M. Birnbaum "Threefold upconversion pumped laser at 0.85, 1.23, and $1.73\mu\text{m}$ in Er:YLF pumped with a $1.53\mu\text{m}$ Er:glass laser", *Appl.Phys.Lett.* **54**(10), 869-871 (1989).
18. S. Pollack, D. Chang, M. Birnbaum, and M. Kokta, "Upconversion-pumped $2.8\text{-}2.9\mu\text{m}$ lasing of Er^{3+} ion in garnets", *J.Appl.Phys.* **70**(12), 7227-7239 (1991).
19. R. A. McFarlane, M. Robinson, S. A. Pollack, D. B. Chang, and H. Jenssen, "Visible and infrared laser operation by upconversion pumping of Erbium-doped fluorides", in *Tunable Solid State Lasers*, Vol. 5, 1989, pp179-186.
20. V. I. Zhekov, T. M. Murina, A. M. Prokhorov, M. I. Studenikin, S. Georgescu, V. Lupei, and I. Ursu, "Cooperative process in

$\text{Y}_3\text{Al}_5\text{O}_{12}:\text{Er}^{3+}$ crystals", Sov. J. Quantum Electron. **16**(2), 274-276, (1986).

21. V. P. Gapontsev, M. E. Zhabotinskii, A. A. Izyneev, V. B. Kravchenko, and Yu. P. Rudnitskii, "Effective 1.054-1.54 μ stimulated emission conversion", JETP Lett. **18**,251-253 (1973).

22. L. M. Franz and J. S. Nodvik, "Theory of pulse propagation in a laser amplifier", J.Appl. Phys. **34**(8), 2346(1963).

23. R. Bellman, G. Birnbaum, and W. G. Wagner, "Transmission of monochromatic radiation in a two-level material", J.Appl.Phys.**34**(4), 780(1963)

24. P. V. Avizonis and R. L. Grotbeck, "Experimental and theoretical ruby laser amplifier dynamics", J.Appl.Phys. **37**(2), 687(1966).

25. A. Siegman, "Lasers", University Science Books (Mill Valley, CA, 1986), pp 363-372.

26. S. Georgescu, V. Lupei, A. Lupei, V. I. Zhekov, T. M. Murina, and M. I. Studenikin, "Concentration effects on the upconversion from the $4\text{I}_{13/2}$ level of Er^{+3} in YAG", Opt.Comm.**81**(3,4)186(1991).

27. D. K. Killinger, "Er:YAG laser crystal characterization", Quarterly technical report, Solid-state research, Lincoln Laboratory, M.I.T., Lexington, Massachusetts, pg 9 (Nov., 1985).

28. R.D.Stultz, M.B.Camargo, S.T.Montgomery, M.Birnbaum, and K.Spariosu, "U⁴⁺:SrF₂ efficient saturable absorber Q-switch for the 1.54 μ m Er:glass laser", Accepted for publication and scheduled to appear in Feb., 1994 issue of Applied Physics Letters.

List of Figures

Table1. 1.532 μ m pumped 1.645 μ m Er:YAG laser performance.

Figure 1. Energy level diagram for Er³⁺ showing the ion pair upconversion effect and the resulting upconversion fluorescence.

Figure 2. QE7 Er:glass laser performance at 1.532 μ m for a 180 μ F PFN (\approx 1ms flashlamp pulse), and a 270 μ F PFN (\approx 1.5ms flashlamp pulse).

Figure 3. Comparison between absorption (dashed curve) and photoluminescence (solid curve) spectra for 0.5% Er:YAG.

Figure 4. Experimental arrangement for absorption (and bleaching) measurements.

Figure 5. Absorption saturation in 1cm thick 0.5,1,2% Er:YAG crystals. The dashed curves represent the MFN model and the solid curves represent the NIM model.

Figure 6. Incident and transmitted 1.532 μ m spiking pulses, and the corresponding integrated 1.532 μ m incident and transmitted energy pulses (spiking signals not to scale).

Figure 7. Experimental arrangement for upconversion fluorescence measurements.

Figure 8. 1.532 μ m pumped 980nm upconversion fluorescence in Er:YAG (4%,1%,2% lowest-highest). The rectangle represents the 1.532 μ m pump pulse. The small peaks at the beginning are due to scattered flashlamp radiation and the large delayed peaks are those due to upconversion fluorescence.

Figure 9. Experimental arrangement for measuring the Er:YAG laser characteristics.

Figure 10. 1.645 μ m laser output (top trace) with the corresponding 1.532 μ m pump (lower trace) for the 1%Er:YAG laser.

Figure 11. Er:YAG laser energy output performance.

Figure 12. Er^{3+} :YAG energy level diagram (300K) showing the 1.532 μm pumped 1.645 μm laser transition and the appropriate Boltzmann factors.




Figure 1. Energy level diagram for Er^{3+} showing the ion pair upconversion effect and the resulting upconversion fluorescence.




Figure 2. QE7 Er:glass laser performance at $1.532\mu\text{m}$




Figure 3. 0.5%Er:YAG absorption (dashed curved) and photoluminescence (solid curve)




Figure 4. Experimental arrangement for absorption (and bleaching) measurements




Figure 5. Absorption saturation in 1cm thick 0.5, 1.2% Er:YAG crystals; dashed curves:MFN model; solid curves:NIM model




Figure 6. 4%0.25cm Er:YAG spiking and corresponding integrated 1.532 μ m incident and transmitted energy (spiking signals not to scale)




Figure 7. Experimental arrangement for upconversion fluorescence measurements.




Figure 8. 1.532 μ m pumped 980nm upconversion fluorescence in Er:YAG (4%,1%,2% lowest-highest); rectangle depicts the temporally relative position of the pump pulse




Figure 9. Experimental arrangement for measuring the Er:YAG laser characteristics.




Figure 10. 1%Er:YAG 1.645μm laser output (top trace)
lower trace:1.532μm pump (120mJ)




Figure 11. Er:YAG laser energy output performance




Figure 12. $\text{Er}^{3+}:\text{YAG}$ energy level diagram (300K) showing the $1.532\mu\text{m}$ pumped $1.645\mu\text{m}$ laser transition and the appropriate Boltzmann factors.

1.643 μ Er³⁺:Y₃Sc₂Ga₃O₁₂ (Er:YSGG) laser at 300K

by:

Kalin Spariosu and Milton Birnbaum

Center for Laser Studies

University of Southern California

DRB B17, University Park

Los Angeles, CA 90089-1112

and:

Milan Kokta,

Union Carbide Corp.

Washougal, Washington 98671

Abstract

The first $^4I_{13/2}$ - $^4I_{15/2}$ laser transition at 1.643μ in $\text{Er}^{3+}:\text{Y}_3\text{Sc}_2\text{Ga}_3\text{O}_{12}$ (Er:YSGG) at 300K is reported. An Er:glass laser (1.532μ) was used in an end pumping arrangement to obtain laser output from a 1cm long 0.7%Er(3%Yb,1%Cr):YSGG crystal in an external cavity. The Er:YSGG laser exhibited a 20mJ threshold and a 8% slope efficiency.

Introduction

The first $^4I_{13/2}$ - $^4I_{15/2}$ laser action near 1.6μ was demonstrated in Er:CaWO₄¹ followed by reported laser action in Er:CaF₂², and in Er:LaF₃³, all near 1.6μ . All the above reports utilized flash lamp pumping at 77K. The first 1.645μ $^4I_{13/2}$ - $^4I_{15/2}$ laser action in Er:YAG was achieved by Johnson et al⁴ at 77K and later at room temperature as reported by White and Schleusener⁵, again using flash lamp excitation in both cases. More recently, CW oscillation at 1.645μ in Er:YAG was achieved using a Kr ion laser at 0.647μ in an end pumping arrangement^{6,7}. We reported on 1.532μ pumped 1.645μ Er:YAG lasers at 300K in a standard outside cavity pumping arrangement using an Er:glass laser as the pump source in an end pumped configuration⁸. Here, we report on the first 1.643μ laser action in the $^4I_{13/2}$ - $^4I_{15/2}$ transition in Er:YSGG.

Experimental Results

Absorption measurements of our uncoated 1cm thick 0.7%Er(3%Yb,1%Cr):YSGG crystal (with parallel and polished faces) were obtained using a Varian CARY model 2415 spectrophotometer (see Figure 1). The small signal absorption coefficient of 0.7%Er:YSGG at the 1.532μ m Er:glass pump laser wavelength was determined to be $\alpha = 0.84 \text{ cm}^{-1}$. The determination of α was carried out after first calibrating out the surface reflection (Fresnel) losses

($\approx 12\%$) but including the rest of the base line background in our calculation (see Figure 1). The small signal absorption, $\alpha L = 0.84$, was confirmed using the $1.532\mu\text{m}$ Er:glass laser⁹ at low output levels.

We repeated the absorption spectra measurements several times using the CARY and consistently obtained roughly the same background base line. We did not observe a wavelength dependent base line variation (as would be indicative of Cr^{4+} absorption), and, therefore, concluded that the origin of this residual base-line absorption could be attributed to poor crystal quality. At 300K the individual Stark lines were not resolved (as would be possible at cryogenic temperatures).

Measurements of the induced transparency (bleaching) in our Er:YSGG crystal were obtained using the $1.532\mu\text{m}$ Er:glass laser as the pump. The bleaching results are shown in Figure 2 (the theoretical curve was obtained using the theoretical analysis outlined in a following section of the paper). A photoluminescence experiment was carried out on the Er:YSGG crystal, and the results are shown in Figure 3. From the identified fluorescence peak in Figure 3, and from the Er:YSGG energy level diagram¹⁰ of Figure 4 we identified the 1.643μ lasing transition to be $^4\text{I}_{13/2}:\text{z3}(6596\text{cm}^{-1})$ - $^4\text{I}_{15/2}:\text{y8}(509\text{cm}^{-1})$.

The laser pumped lasing experimental arrangement is shown in Figure 5. The Er:glass laser pump laser operated in a single shot mode at 1.532μ , utilizing a flat-flat resonator. A typical free running spiking Er:glass laser output was approximately 1.5ms in duration.

In order to separate the 1.643 μ Er:YSGG output from the stronger Er:glass laser output at 1.532 μ , a notch filter (1.532 μ to 1.643 μ rejection ratio of 60 to 1) was used. The 1.643 μ Er:YSGG laser light was sampled out of mirror M1, counter-propagating with respect to the 1.532 μ Er:glass pump because M1 was the output coupler ($T \approx 5\%$) at 1.643 μ (see Figure 5). Furthermore, the small reflection ($R \approx 10\%$) at 1.532 μ from M1 provided for a higher 1.643 μ to 1.532 μ rejection ratio than would be available with $\approx 50\%$ transmission of mirror M2 at 1.532 μ in a co-propagating signal detection mode ($R_{1.643\mu m} > 99.9\%$ for M2). The measurement of the Er:YSGG laser output wavelength was carried out using a Jarrell-Ash 0.25m monochromator. Laser action was obtained at 300K with a 0.7%Er(3%Yb,1%Cr):YSGG crystal 1cm long with ends polished flat, parallel and uncoated.

The spiking 1.643 μ output of the 0.7% Er:YSGG laser is shown in the top trace of Figure 6, where the bottom trace shows the corresponding time coincident 1.532 μ Er:glass pump. The signals were detected using Ge detectors and a dual beam HP 54510A digitizing oscilloscope. Typical duration of the free running spiking Er:glass output was 1.5ms. The 1.643 μ laser action persisted for the duration of the 1.532 μ pump pulse (after the laser onset delay). The 1.643 μ output was shown to have a pulse to pulse correspondence with the pump (similar to the results found in Er:YAG lasers⁸), but with a slight delay.

The input versus output energy data is presented in Figure 7. We define the differential energy absorbed as the 1.532 μ energy

absorbed during 1.643 μ lasing, plus the measured 1.532 μ energy absorbed required to reach threshold. The absorbed energy was determined using two calorimeters as shown in Figure 5. Several runs were made yielding a measured threshold of about 20mJ, and a slope efficiency of 8%. The calorimeters used were: Scientech 365 and the Laser Precision RJ7200. The Er:YSGG laser cavity was 5 cm long with flat-flat mirrors.

Theoretical Analysis

The pulse propagation through an active (absorbing or amplifying) medium involves the solution of the radiation transport equation as presented by several authors¹¹⁻¹⁴. The solution generally involves the compression of either the space or the time variable. Following the method of Siegman¹⁴, we solved the following coupled equations:

$$\frac{d\Delta N(t)}{dt} = -\frac{2}{h\nu_p} [I_{in}(t) (e^{\sigma\Delta N(t)} - 1)] \quad (1)$$

$$U_{out}(t) = \int_{t_0}^t I_{out}(t) dt = U_{sat} \ln \left[\frac{(e^{\sigma\Delta N_0} - 1)}{(e^{\sigma\Delta N(t)} - 1)} \right] \quad (2),$$

where ΔN is the spatially integrated localized population difference¹⁴ (units: $[\text{cm}^{-2}]$), σ is the effective absorption cross-section, $\sigma_{\text{eff}} = 9.2 \times 10^{-21} \text{cm}^2$, $h\nu_p$ is the pump photon energy, and U_{sat} is the saturation fluence defined as $U_{\text{sat}} = \frac{h\nu}{\sigma}$. The method of solution then involves the propagation of successive pulselets through the spatially segmented medium updating the level populations after each pulselet has gone through. The calculation was carried out numerically and the bleaching results are shown in Figure 2. As can be noted from Figure 2, there is close agreement between theory and experiment for a pumped volume of 0.005cm^3 , corresponding to the pump radius, $a \approx 0.04 \text{cm}$.

Threshold energy was evaluated as follows: Since the $1.643 \mu\text{m}$ laser action occurs between the Stark levels y_3 and z_8 , we can write the threshold condition as

$$N_{y3} - N_{z8} = \Delta N_{\text{th}} \quad (3)$$

where the Stark levels are defined in terms of the total manifold populations ($y: {}^4I_{13/2}$, $z: {}^4I_{15/2}$) as

$$N_{y3} = \frac{f_{y3}}{Z_y} N_y, \quad N_{z8} = \frac{f_{z8}}{Z_z} N_z \quad (4)$$

f_{y3} , and f_{z8} are the appropriate Boltzmann factors and the partition functions are:

$$Z_{y,z} = \sum_{i=1}^{(7,8)} e^{-\frac{\Delta E_i}{kT}} \quad (5)$$

Taking into account Stark level structure and knowing that only a fraction of the absorbed photons contributes to the population inversion, we can write the equation for pump energy threshold as:

$$E_{th} = \frac{Vh\nu_p(\delta+T)}{2\sigma_L L(f_3+f_4)} + \frac{N_t f_4 Vh\nu_p}{(f_3+f_4)} \quad (6)$$

where N_t is the Er doping density, f_3 and f_4 are the Boltzmann factors of the laser levels, δ is the round trip cavity loss, T is the output coupling loss, σ_L is the stimulated emission cross section, and ν_p is the pump laser frequency.

Given $T \approx 0.05$, $V = 0.005 \text{ cm}^3$, and the experimentally determined value of $\sigma_L = 1.7 \times 10^{-20} \text{ cm}^2$ (from absorption spectra), we calculated the pump threshold energy ($\delta=0$, assumes only output coupler loss) to $\approx 9 \text{ mJ}$. This is approximately a factor of two less than the experimentally determined threshold value of $\approx 20 \text{ mJ}$, indicative of the presence of additional losses. Our low slope efficiency (8%)

confirmed this observation. Enumerating factors contributing to inefficiency: imperfect pump/laser mode volume overlap, scattering losses, end reflection losses, etc. Clearly, additional work will be required to optimize this new laser.

Conclusions

The first operation of the $^4I_{13/2}$ - $^4I_{15/2}$ 1.643 μ m Er:YSGG laser at 300K is described. The 0.7% Er:YSGG laser had operated quasi-CW, with the 1.643 μ m laser action persisting for the duration of the 1.532 μ m pump pulse (after the onset delay).

Acknowledgements

We thank Mr. John Meyers of the KIGRE Corp. for the gift of several KIGRE Er:phosphate glass laser rods used in these experiments.

References

1. Z.J.Kiss and R.C.Duncan Jr. , "Optical Maser Action in $\text{CaWO}_4:\text{Er}^{+3}$ " Proc. IRE **50**,1531 (1962).
2. S.A.Pollack, "Stimulated Emission in $\text{CaF}_2:\text{Er}^{+3}$ ", Proc. IEEE **51**,1793-1794 (1963).
3. W.F.Krupke and J.B.Gruber, "Energy Levels of Er^{+3} in LaF_3 and coherent emission at 1.61μ ", J.Chem. Phys.**41**(5),1225-1232 (1964).
4. L.F.Johnson, J.E.Geusic and L.G.VanUitert, "Coherent Oscillations from Tm^{+3} , Ho^{+3} , Yb^{+3} , and Er^{+3} , ions in Yttrium Aluminum Garnet", Appl.Phys.Lett. **7**(5),127-129 (1965).
5. K.O.White and S.A.Schleusener, "Coincidence of Er:YAG laser emission with methane absorption at 1645.1nm ", Appl.Phys.Lett. **21**,419-420 (1972).
6. G.Huber, E.W.Duczynski, and K.Petermann, "Laser pumping of Ho-, Tm-, Er-doped Garnet lasers at room temperature", IEEE J.Quant. Electron. **24**(6), 920-923 (1988).
7. H.Stange, K.Petermann, G.Huber, and E.W.Duczynski, "Continuous wave 1.6μ laser action in Er-doped garnets at room temperature", Appl.Phys.B **49**, 269-273 (1989).
8. K.Spariosu and M. Birnbaum, "Room temperature 1.645 micron Er:YAG lasers", OSA Proceedings on Advanced Solid-State Lasers, Feb.17-19, 1992, Santa Fe, New Mexico, p127-130.
9. E.Zharikov, N.N.Il'ichev, S.P.Kalitin, V.V.Laptev, A.A.Malyutin, V.V.Osiko, P.P.Pashinin, A.M.Prokhorov, Z.V.Saidov, V.A.Smirnov, A.F.Umyskov, and I.A.Shcherbakov, "Spectral, luminescence, and lasing properties of a yttrium scandium gallium garnet crystal activated with chromium and erbium", Sov. J. Quantum Electron. **16**, 635-639 (1986).
10. Lee M. Frantz and John S. Nodvik, "Theory of pulse propagation in a laser amplifier", J.Appl. Phys. **34**(8), 2346-2349 (1963).
11. R.Bellman, G.Birnbaum, and W.G.Wagner, "Transmission of monochromatic radiation in a two-level material", J.Appl.Phys.**34**(4), 780-782 (1963).

12. P.V.Avizonis and R.L.Grotbeck, "Experimental and theoretical ruby laser amplifier dynamics", J.Appl.Phys. **37**(2), 687-693 (1966).
13. A.Siegman, "Lasers", University Science Books (Mill Valley, CA, 1986),pg 363-372.

Figure Captions

- Figure 1. Absorption spectra of 0.7%Er(Yb,Cr):YSGG (theoretical curve was obtained using the numerical calculations outlined in the text).
- Figure 2. Absorption saturation in 0.7%Er(Yb,Cr):YSGG (experimental and theoretical).
- Figure 3. Photoluminescence spectra for 0.7%Er(Yb,Cr):YSGG.
- Figure 4. Er:YSGG energy level diagram at 300K.
- Figure 5. Experimental arrangement for measuring the 0.7%Er(Yb,Cr):YSGG. laser performance.
- Figure 6. 1.532 μ m (bottom trace) pumped 1.643 μ m laser action (top trace) (100 μ s per division).
- Figure 7. 1.643 μ m 0.7%Er(Yb,Cr):YSGG laser output as a function of 1.532 μ m pump energy absorbed.




Figure 1: 0.7% Er:(Yb,Cr) YSGG absorption




Figure 2: Absorption saturation in 0.7%Er(Yb, Cr):YSGG
(theoretical curve was obtained using the
numerical modeling outlined in the text)




Figure 3: 0.7% Er:YSGG photoluminescence




Figure 4. Stark energy level diagram for the ground and first excited states of Er:YSGG at 300K.




Figure 5. Experimental set-up for measuring the Er:YSGG laser performance




Figure 6. 1.532 μ m (bottom trace) pumped 1.643 μ m laser action (top trace) (100 μ s per division).




Figure 7: 0.7% Er:YSGG laser output